

HERALD
OF THE
KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.

“Earnestly contend for the Faith, which was once delivered to the Saints.”—Jude

Volume 1—Number 8 (August 1851)

IS THE RESTORATION OF SACRIFICES COMPATIBLE WITH THE PRINCIPLES
OF THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST?

Dear Brother:

My attention has been lately called by one of our friends at Nottingham to certain testimonies of Ezekiel and Paul relating to the re-establishment of Israel in Palestina under the New Covenant, between which there is an apparent discrepancy. Paul’s argument in the tenth of Hebrews, that the remission of sins promised to them therein removes the occasion for further propitiatory offerings, seems to militate against Ezekiel’s representation of the restoration of these at the period referred to. Paul argues in the eighteenth verse, that “where remission of these (sins) is there is no more offering for sin;” whilst Ezekiel shows in chapter forty-five, and verse seventeen, that at that epoch sacrifices shall be offered by their Levitical priests, the sons of Zadoc—“the sin offering, and the meat offering, and the burnt offering, and the peace offerings, to make reconciliation for them.” “Their sins and iniquities will I remember no more,” says the Lord. In the subject which Paul illustrates by this citation from the New Covenant, he is showing how the one offering of Christ excelled and superseded all the shadowy sacrifices of the Mosaic institution—how in putting away at once and for ever the sins of those sanctified by it “it perfected them for a continuance,” or so long as they should abide in Him; and even thus, his teaching indicates, that God’s pardoned Israel will be perfected in conscience by the blood of a new and “everlasting covenant;” by which they seem to be placed at the period of their reinstatement into his favor, in the position of the baptised believer now, to whom in Christ Jesus there is no condemnation. Wherefore, then, the reinstatement of those “sacrifices which can never take away sins?” And that the sacrifices Ezekiel speaks of are not simply commemorative is evident for their being “to make reconciliation for the House of Israel.” Again, the Levitical “service” Paul distinctly states to have been imposed until the time of reformation—Hebrews 9: 10; thereby intimating its discontinuance then. He appears to indicate its abolition in the Future Age by the establishment of the “better” covenant; whilst Ezekiel exhibits it as restored at that epoch.

The above is briefly the difficulty as it presents itself to us. If you, or any correspondent of the Herald, can furnish us with an exegesis exhibiting these apparently conflicting testimonies in their real agreement, it will be esteemed a favor by several of your friends here. Will you remember us in your next Herald, state the difficulty, and reply to it? In so doing you will also greatly oblige your sister in the faith and hope of the kingdom.

ELLEN MILNER.

Derby England; June, 1851.

EXEGESIS.

“THEOLOGY” IRRECONCILABLE WITH SCRIPTURE.

We have thought that in “stating the difficulty,” we could not do better than in giving it to the reader in the words of our much esteemed and intelligent correspondent herself. The difficulty, then, being thus lucidly exhibited by our sister friend, we shall endeavour to remove it in presenting the apparently conflicting testimonies adduced in their real, or prophetic and apostolic agreement.

The apparent discrepancy, and it is only apparent, has originated in the old leaven of an antiquated theology, which in its interpretations, or rather glosses, has no regard to the prophetic teaching concerning the rebuilding of the Tabernacle of David “as in the days of old”—Amos 9: 11-15; Acts 15: 16—by the Lord Jesus, Israel’s king, who is, “The Repairer of the breach, THE RESTORER of paths to dwell in.”—Isaiah 58: 12; 49: 5, 6-8. This is an element in its exegesis hidden from its view, and therefore entirely omitted. Being ignorant of the gospel of the kingdom, and consequently of the nature of that kingdom, it has denied in the face of the most palpable and positive testimonies, that sacrifices are to be restored at all; and taking refuge in the assumption, that Ezekiel’s doctrine was either figurative or fulfilled at the restoration from the captivity in Babylon! Thus the difficulty was got rid of, but not explained; and by a bounding leap in the dark, it came to the conclusion that the sacrifice of Jesus was the final and entire abolition of “the sin offering, and the meat offering, and the burnt offering, and the peace offerings to make reconciliation for Israel.” Our beloved sister in the faith and friends for whom she speaks, are hearty believers in the Restoration of the kingdom again to Israel—Acts 1: 6; and having mastered many difficulties in their way by which they have been enabled to attain to the understanding of the gospel of the kingdom, are desirous of going on to perfection in divesting their minds entirely of the miserable traditions which have been imposed upon them by the Gentilisms in which “they happened to be led.” They see that a Temple for the third and last time is to be erected in David’s tabernacle, when Jerusalem shall put on her beautiful garments, and Zion shall arise and shine because her Light has come, and the glory of the Lord has risen upon her. —Isaiah 60: 1; 52: 1. They know that this temple is to be built by the man, whose name is the Branch—Zechariah 6: 12, and that it will then be a house of prayer for all nations—Isaiah 56: 7; and they are well assured that the rams of Nebaioth shall come up with acceptance as burnt offerings and sacrifices on the altar of the God of Israel—Isaiah 60: 7: they believe all this with full assurance of faith because it is written as with a sunbeam on the sure prophetic page. But then their difficulty is, how can it be reconciled with the received interpretation of Paul’s saying, that the Levitical service was imposed only until the time of reformation? It cannot be reconciled, for truth and error are irreconcilable. Paul and the prophets are in harmony; for he declares that he said none other things than what they testified—Acts 24: 14; 26: 22; but Paul and the prophets are at antipodes with the gentile interpreters of their testimony. We shall abandon the idea, therefore, of attempting to reconcile them; but, by the undeviating magnet of truth, which ever points to the kingdom as the polar star in the voyage of faith upon life’s stormy sea, we shall shape for ourselves a new course, which we doubt not, will conduct us without wreck or disaster into the haven of our sister’s desire.

BRIEF PRELIMINARY NOTICE OF THE KINGDOM.

The Bible is the Book of the Kingdom of God, and teaches us that it has already once existed for 1024 years under Moses, Joshua, the Judges, and Kings. With the exception of the two years of Ishbosheth's reign, it was a united kingdom for 92 years of this millennium under Saul, David, Solomon, and the first four years of Rehoboam. From the 4th of Rehoboam it was governed by two dynasties. Ten of its tribes were ruled by kings whom they set up over themselves without regard to the authority of Jehovah to whom the kingdom belonged. —Hosea 8: 4. Thus they raised the standard of rebellion, and rejected the sovereignty of the House of David, which God had chosen to be the royal house of his kingdom as long as the sun and moon should endure throughout all generations. This usurped royalty of Ephraim, or of the Ten Tribes, continued 256 years; but Judah yet ruled with God, and was faithful with the Most Holy—Hosea 11: 12, whose dynasty of the family of David they still continued to acknowledge. In the sixth year of Hezekiah, king of Judah, the Ten Tribes were “removed out of God's sight”—2 Kings 17: 18, that is, they were driven out of his land or kingdom, and the Tribe of Judah only remained. In a few years, however, Judah became unmanageable. “The chief of the priests and the people transgressed very much after all the abominations of the heathen; and polluted the temple of the Lord which he had hallowed in Jerusalem. And the Lord God of their fathers sent to them by his messengers, continually and carefully sending; because he had compassion on his people, and on his dwelling place: but they mocked the messengers of God, and despised his words and misused his prophets, until the wrath of Jehovah arose against his people, till there was no remedy. Therefore he brought upon them the king of the Chaldees.”—2 Chronicles 36: 14-17. This event happened 134 years after the removal of Ephraim out of his sight, or 390 years from the rebellion against the house of David; so that during 474 years of this millennium of the kingdom of God, David and his lineal descendants reigned over the House of Judah.

The kingdom of God thus brought to a temporary conclusion has never existed since under the sovereignty of a king or kings of the house of David. Its existence ceased even as a Commonwealth during the captivity in Babylon which lasted seventy years. At the end of this period the kingdom reappeared in Judea; but it was no longer governed by Jewish monarchs exalted to the throne either by God or the people. Jehovah permitted his kingdom to be subject to the lordship of the Gentiles, until the end of 430 years from the burning of the temple by Nebuchadnezzar. For 122 years after the interposition of the Roman Senate, God's kingdom was ruled by Jewish princes of the tribe of Levi, that is, until the Gentile of Idumea, named Herod, became king in Jerusalem, in the 37th year of whose reign JESUS, the Son of God and of David, and the rightful heir of the throne of Jehovah's kingdom, was born King of the Jews. From the commencement of Herod's reign till the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, a period of 111 years, the kingdom of God was possessed by the Gentiles; in other words, Israel did not possess the kingdom. From the knowledge of this fact, the reader will be well able to appreciate the force of the question put by the apostles to Jesus after his resurrection, and as the result of their conversation for forty days upon the subject of the kingdom, saying, “Lord, wilt thou at this time RESTORE AGAIN the kingdom to Israel?”—Acts 1: 6. They knew that he was “THE RESTORER;” and believing that “all power was given unto him in heaven and earth,” they thought the time had certainly come for the Restoration of all things to Israel spoken of by all the prophets from the days of Moses. —Deuteronomy 30: 1-10. This supposition prompted the question. But they were too fast. Messiah the prince having come, the kingdom could not be

“restored again to Israel” so long as the Mosaic Covenant continued in force. This must be “changed,” the kingdom must be suppressed and desolated, and Jerusalem, the city of the Great King of Israel, be trodden under foot of the Gentiles until their times be fulfilled. They had forgotten these things, and that the kingdom of God was not immediately to appear under the sovereignty of the Son of Man; but that he was first to take a journey into a far country—Luke 19: 11-12, where he was to be detained until “the times of the restitution”—Acts 3: 21, called also “the Regeneration”—Matthew 19: 28, should arrive. In the year 74 after the birth of Jesus the kingdom was broken up, and the Mosaic covenant trampled under foot—not finally abolished, but temporarily suppressed, that it may be “changed” in certain essential and highly important particulars. God has had no organised kingdom upon earth since its overthrow by the Roman power. The kingdom in the sense of its territory is where it always was; and its children, or subjects, “his people Israel,” are to be found in every land, still in hope that the time will come when the kingdom will be restored again to them; and “God will subdue the people under them, and the nations under their feet”—Psalm 47: 3; for they do not forget the testimony, that “the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem,” and that “the nation and kingdom that will not serve Zion shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted.”—Micah 4: 7-8; Isaiah 60: 12. The Heir of the kingdom is at the right hand of the Divine Majesty; and his joint-heirs, the most of them, mouldering and sleeping in the dust, with a few surviving stragglers still existing in the protestant section of the globe, enduring reproach and tribulation in the hope of its speedy and triumphant restitution. These are the dissolved and scattered fragments of the kingdom of God. Their reunion is a matter of promise, and consequently of hope. The Gentiles must be expelled the territory; the twelve tribes must be replanted upon the land; the sleeping heirs of the government must be awaked, and the living believers in this kingdom changed: and to effect all this, God’s Heir, the Restorer of the Kingdom, must come and subdue all things to himself. When these things shall come to pass, God will have “accomplished to scatter the power of the Holy people”—Daniel 12: 7, that is, their power shall be no more scattered, but shall be restored to them: and He will have come whose right the kingdom is, and God will give it him. —Ezekiel 21: 27.

Having thus presented the reader with a few ideas concerning the kingdom that he may have something tangible and definite before his mind when we refer to it, we shall proceed now to make a few remarks in answer to the inquiry

WHAT IS A COVENANT?

The Kingdom as it was, and the kingdom as it is to be, although the same kingdom, is exhibited in the scriptures under Two Covenants, or constitutions. But before adverting more particularly to these it may be necessary to say a word or two in answer to the inquiry, “What is a Covenant?” It is a word of very frequent occurrence in scripture, and the representative in our language of the Hebrew berith. In English, covenant signifies “a mutual agreement of two or more persons to do or forbear some act or thing.” This, however, is not the sense of the word berith when used in relation to the things of the kingdom. Men’s compliance or acceptance does not constitute the berith of the kingdom a covenant. It is a covenant whether they consent or not, and is enforced as the imperious enactment of an absolute king. It points out God’s chosen, selected, and determined plan or purpose, entirely independent of any one’s consent, either asked or given, and is equivalent to a system of government fixed by the Prince, and imposed on the

people without the slightest consultation between them. Accordingly, what is called the covenant in one place, is denominated the law in another. As, “he hath remembered his covenant for ever, the word which he commanded to a thousand generations; which covenant he made with Abraham and confirmed the same unto Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant.” “These are the words of the covenant which the Lord commanded Moses to make with the children of Israel. Thus saith the Lord, cursed be the man that obeyeth not the words of this covenant which I commanded your fathers.” It is evident from this that covenant and law are used as synonymous and convertible terms.

The statements of the New Testament conduct us to the same conclusion. It may be proper to remark here that a berith, or covenant, is expressed in Greek by *diatheke*. This is the word used in the Septuagint as the translation of berith. It signifies an appointment; not a mutual compact, but the arrangement, settled plan, or institution of one party alone; and is the term used to denote the testamentary deeds of the deceased, in which the will and pleasure of the legatees is never consulted. “For where a *diatheke* is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator; for a testament (*diatheke*, covenant or will) is of force when men are dead, otherwise it is of no force at all while the testator liveth.”—Hebrews 9: 6.

THE COVENANTS OF THE KINGDOM.

The beriths, *diathekes*, or covenants of the kingdom of God are absolute decrees, which make, or constitute things what they were, and what they shall be. Hence “the Builder and Maker (or constitutor) of all things is God,” “for whose pleasure they are and were created.” But though these covenants are absolute, and the necessity to observe them imperative on all who are placed under them, they are replete with blessings to Israel and the nations, being founded upon “exceeding great and precious promises.” Hence they are styled “the covenants of promise.”—Ephesians 2: 12. One of them is styled “the Covenant from Mount Sinai;” and the other, the Covenant from Jerusalem which is above and free—he and Jerusalem. —Galatians 4: 24-27. The Sinai Covenant is synonymous with the Jerusalem Covenant which now is, that is, as it existed in Paul’s day; while the other covenant is the Jerusalem Covenant which is to be; and because Jerusalem, which is now “desolate,” will then be “free,” and “above” Jerusalem in her greatest glory under the Sinai Covenant, she is styled “ano,” that is, above, higher, or more exalted: and is “the mother of all” who believe the things of the kingdom of God, which will come, or be restored, to her, when as “the city of the Great King,” she shall have awaked from her present non-vinous inebriation, and have put on “her beautiful garments.”—Isaiah 51: 21; 52: 1.

Strictly speaking, the Sinai Covenant, although based on promises, is not one of “the covenants of promise” Paul refers to in Ephesians. These are the Covenant of promise to Abraham, and the Covenant of promise to David; both of which are elemental principles of the Covenant of the Free Jerusalem, which is to “go forth from Zion in the latter days.” —Isaiah 2: 3. The Sinai covenant is styled “the first;” the one to be hereafter proclaimed to Israel, “the second,” although the latter is more ancient than the Sinai law in promise by 430 years, yet as a national berith constituting the kingdom of God in its civil and ecclesiastical appurtenances under Messiah the prince and the saints, it is second in the order of proclamation to the Twelve Tribes. The promises of the first covenant, which was added—(Galatians 3: 19)—to the ancient

covenant, were the blessings of Mount Gerizzim consequent upon their hearkening to the voice of Jehovah their God. —Deuteronomy 28: 1-14. In these there was no promise of eternal glory, and life; of an everlasting, individual and national inheritance of the land; of universal dominion under Abraham's Seed; of everlasting righteousness from one atonement; and of no possible evil coming upon them as a nation. On the contrary, the promises were accompanied with terrible threatenings, which have resulted in all the curses Jehovah pronounced upon them for not observing to do all his commandments and statutes.

But the Second Covenant of the kingdom of Israel is established, or ordained for a law (nomothetein,) upon better promises; and is therefore styled "a better covenant."—Hebrews 8: 6. It abolishes the remembrance of national offences every year. Under the Sinai covenant these accumulated notwithstanding the yearly atonement, until the magnitude of its guilt crushed the nation, and caused its dispersion into all the kingdoms of the earth, as at this day. The better covenant, however, promises to Israel a great and everlasting amnesty for all past national transgression—Jeremiah 31: 31-34, not by virtue of the sacrifice of bulls and goats, which cannot take away sins, offered up by a sinful priest of the order of Aaron; but by a purification that shall be vouchsafed to the repentant tribes, issuing forth from "a fountain opened to the House of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and uncleanness"—Zechariah 13: 1; the blood of which has been carried into the presence of Jehovah himself by Jesus—Hebrews 9: 24, a High Priest of the tribe of Judah, consecrated after the power of an endless life—Hebrews 7: 16, who will then have appeared the second time—Hebrews 9: 28, having returned from the Most Holy to proclaim to his nation that God has been merciful to their unrighteousness, and will henceforth remember their sins and iniquities no more. This great national reconciliation being consummated, and the Twelve Tribes grafted into their own Olive again, they will then enjoy the better promises of the Second Covenant. A new heart, and a new spirit they will then possess. They will be God's reconciled people, and he will be their God. He will call for the corn and increase it, and lay no famine upon them; and they shall receive no more reproach among the nations. Their land that was desolate will then be as the garden of Eden. —Ezekiel 36: 25-38. Jerusalem will be a rejoicing, and Israel a joy. Their lives shall endure as the days of a tree, and they shall wear out the works of their hands. —Isaiah 65: 17-25. These are a few incidents of the national blessedness that awaits Israel, when the kingdom of God shall be restored to them, and established in the second millennium of its independence under the New and Better covenant.

THE MOSAIC CONSTITUTION OF THE KINGDOM IMPERFECT.

The kingdom of God is the Twelve Tribes of Israel existing in the land promised to Abraham and Christ. When it existed of old time, the Mosaic Covenant was its civil and ecclesiastical code, which appointed and defined all things. But since the appearance of Jesus in Israel, certain things have come to pass in connexion with him, which necessitate a change or amendment of the covenant, or constitution, that provision may be made, or scope afforded, for the exercise of his functions as High Priest and king in Israel; and for the carrying out of the principles which emanate from the dedication or purification of the New Covenant by his blood. This is the necessity which existed for a change of the law; "for the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law."—Hebrews 7: 12. The Sinai Constitution of the Kingdom established a changeable priesthood of the tribe of Levi, the chief of which was an hereditary prince of the family of Aaron, called the High Priest. The high-priesthood is an office

divinely created; and no man of Israel was allowed to assume it unless he was called of God as Aaron. It was appointed for the offering for men both gifts to God, and sacrifices for sins; so that the officiating party becomes a mediator between God and men. But the priesthood of Levi and Aaron was imperfect, and therefore could not impart perfection, so as that he who did the service, or the worshippers should have no more conscience of sins, and thereby become heirs of eternal life. This being the nature of the priesthood under which Israel received the Law, or Covenant, the Mosaic institution was weak and unprofitable, and could make nothing perfect. — Hebrews 7: 11, 18-19; 9: 9; 10: 1. This imperfection resulted from the nature of the consecration, or blood of the covenant. Aaron and his sons, the altar, and nearly all the things of the law were purified by the blood of bulls and goats, &c.; which, however, could not sanctify to the purifying of the heart, or the flesh from the evil within it which makes it mortal. It was necessary to perfection that sin should be condemned in the flesh of the High Priest, which could not be effected by condemning sin in the flesh of the animals sacrificed under the Law. This necessity would have required the death of a High Priest at the celebration of every annual atonement at least, being themselves sinners; but as this was incompatible with the nature of things, animal sacrifices were substituted. So that Aaron and his successors could not under penalty of immediate death enter into the Most Holy without this substitutionary blood. But then this blood was deficient of the necessary sin remitting qualities. The blood required was that of the peccant nature—the human; for it was man, and not the creatures, that had sinned. But even human blood would have been unprofitable if it were the blood of one who was himself an actual transgressor, and a victim that even if an innocent person had not come to life again. The Messiah in prophecy asks the question, “What profit is there in my blood, if I go down to the pit? Can the dust praise thee? Can it declare thy truth?”—Psalm 30: 9. The answer is none. For if the Christ had died, and not risen again, he would not have been a living sacrifice, and could not have imparted vitality to the things professedly sanctified by it. The blood of the Mosaic sacrifices was weak and unprofitable because it was not human; because it was not innocent human blood; and because it was not the blood of one innocent of the great transgression, who had come to life again through the power of the Eternal Spirit. For these three important reasons, the blood of the Mosaic covenant could not take away sins, and therefore the High Priest and the nation, individually and collectively, were all left under the curse of the Law, which was death; for “the wages of sin is death.”—Romans 6: 23. The law could not give them life who were under it—Galatians 3: 21, being weak through the flesh—Romans 8: 3, and deriving no vitality from the blood peculiar to it; if it could have conferred a title to eternal life, and consequently to the promises made to Abraham and Christ, then righteousness, justification, or remission of sins would have been by the Covenant of Sinai.

But it may be enquired, if the Mosaic institution could not perfect the conscience, nor give a title to eternal life and the inheritance, but left its subjects dead in trespasses and in sins, by what means will the prophets and those of Israel who died before Christ came, obtain salvation in the kingdom of God? The answer is, that what the Law could not do, the bringing in of a better hope accomplished. —Hebrews 7: 19. The Mosaic sacrifices were provisional, substitutionary, and representative. They pointed to the sacrifice of Christ, which in its retrospective influence was to redeem from death, who then living had not only been circumcised, but had walked also in the steps of that faith of their father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised. For the promise that he should be **THE HEIR OF THE WORLD** was not to Abraham, nor to his Seed—Galatians 3: 29, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith. —Romans 4: 12-13.

One object of Christ's death is plainly declared to have been, "for the transgressions under the first testament;" or as elsewhere expressed, "to redeem them who were under the law."—Hebrews 9: 15; Galatians 4: 5. "By his stripes," says Isaiah, "we are healed. Jehovah hath laid upon him the iniquities of us all. For the transgression of his people was he stricken." The "we," the "us," and the "people" in these texts, are the ancient worthies before and under the Law, as well as those who have believed the gospel, and after his second appearing shall offer "sin offerings, and meat offerings, and burnt offerings, and peace offerings for reconciliation" under the New Covenant consecrated by his most precious blood.

Under the first or Mosaic Covenant, the priests were said to "make reconciliation with the blood of the sacrifices upon the altar, to make atonement for all Israel"—Chronicles 29: 24; so under the second, or New Covenant of the kingdom, Ezekiel speaks of "one lamb to make reconciliation for them."—Ezekiel 45: 15. But withdraw from the premises the death and resurrection of Christ, and faith in them and the promises, and the reconciliation under both covenants is imperfect and vain. Animal sacrifices are necessary to the service as types or patterns, and memorials. The Mosaic reconciliation was typical; the Ezekiel reconciliation, memorial or commemorative. The typical Mosaic could not perfect the conscience of the worshippers, because Christ had not then died and risen again; nor could they when he had risen again; nor could they when he had risen, because they were offered by High Priests, whose functions before God were superseded by a High Priest of the tribe of Judah after another order than that of Aaron, then in the presence of Jehovah himself. The Ezekiel reconciliation, however, will perfect the conscience, because Christ has died and lives forevermore; which death and resurrection connected with the reconciliatory offerings by faith in the worshipper, and offered to God through the Prince of Israel, the High Priest upon his throne after the order of Melchizedec, will constitute sacrifices of a character such as have not been offered on the earth before.

THE PRIESTHOOD OF THE KINGDOM UNDER THE NEW COVENANT.

We demur to our beloved sister's declaration, that "Paul distinctly states that the Levitical service was 'imposed until the time of reformation,' thereby intimating its discontinuance then." The sectarian idea of "the time of reformation" in this text is, until John, and Jesus proclaimed repentance, after which there would be no temple service performed by Levites that God would accept. But this is contrary to the sure word of prophecy, which testifies that "the Messenger of the Covenant shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto Jehovah an offering in righteousness. Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the Lord, as in the days of old, and as in former years."—Malachi 3: 3-4. And again the prophet records Jehovah's declaration, that "David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel: neither shall the priests, the Levites, want a man before him to offer burnt offerings, and to kindle meat offerings, and to do sacrifice continually. Thus saith the Lord, if ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, that there shall not be day and night in their season; (then and not before) may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne; and with the Levites the priests my ministers." From this it is manifest, that the perpetuity of David's throne, and the perpetuity of the Levitical ministrations, are parallel. Some say that David's throne is now occupied in heaven; will these same visionaries affirm that the Levites are offering sacrifices there, for the testimony says, "they shall do

sacrifice continually?!” The truth is that this testimony has regard to the time when the kingdom shall be restored again to Israel. At the time the prophecy was delivered there were unbelievers who, like the Millerites of our day, declared that the Lord had cast off the house of Israel and the house of Judah. Therefore said Jehovah to the prophet, “Considerest thou not what this people have spoken, saying, the two families which the Lord hath chosen he hath even cast them off? Thus they have despised my people, that they should be no more a nation before them. But, if my covenant be not with the day and night, and if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth: then will I cast away the seed of Jacob, and David my servant, so that I will not take any of his seed to be rulers over the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: for I will cause their captivity to return, and have mercy on them.”—Jeremiah 33: 17-26. It is from the time of this return, then, that the perpetuity begins in relation to David’s son, and the Levites. Both houses of Israel are still in captivity; therefore the return is yet future. When that return is accomplished, then henceforth even to “the end” appointed, shall these gracious promises obtain as notable realities in the land of Israel.

It is therefore a principle of the kingdom of God that the Levites shall be priests in that kingdom under the New Covenant, or constitution, as well as under the Old. As it is written, “Thus saith the Lord, They shall be ministers in my temple, having charge of the gates of the house; they shall slay the burnt offering and the sacrifice for the people, and they shall stand before them to minister unto them. They shall not come near unto me, to do the office of a priest unto me, nor to come near to any of my holy things in the most holy place. But I will make them keepers of the charge of the house, for all the service thereof, and for all that shall be done therein.” The reason given why they shall not do the office of a priest before God, but shall act as menials in the service, and in relation only to the people, is because under the Mosaic Covenant “they ministered to the people before their idols, and caused the house of Israel to fall into iniquity.”—Ezekiel 44: 9-14. This is the ground of their future degradation from their former rank, to that of the lowest class of the priesthood under the New Covenant.

The next class of priests above them is to consist of the Levites, the sons of Zadok. —Ezekiel 44: 15. These will have no immediate communication with the people in performing the service, but will officiate intermediately between the people’s priests and “the Prince,” who is then High Priest, and Jehovah’s anointed for ever. It is probable that “the sons of Zadok,” are the sons of the Just One, Zadok signifying just or justified. Zadok, who was contemporary with David and Solomon, is their representative father in the priesthood, as David is their representative father in the royalty, and Abraham their representative father in the faith. Hence in the priesthood, the saints are “the sons of Zadok,” in the royalty, “the sons of the Prince,”—Ezekiel 46: 16 and in the faith, “the seed or sons of Abraham.” Eli and his sons were rejected as representative sacerdotal men, because the sons were wicked, and Eli honoured them above Jehovah. Therefore Jehovah said to him, “I will raise me up a faithful priest, who shall do according to that which is in my heart and in my mind; and I will build him a sure house; and he shall walk before mine ANOINTED for ever.”—1 Samuel 2: 29, 35. He must therefore become immortal. Now under the Mosaic Covenant this “faithful priest” was Zadok, who walked before David and Solomon. When Absalom and Israel rebelled against the Lord’s anointed, Zadok and Abiathar remained faithful with Jehovah and his king. But when David was about to die, Abiathar, who was descended from Eli, conspired to make Adonijah king instead of Solomon; while Zadok continued faithful to David. Solomon, however, being established on the throne “he thrust out

Abiathar from being priest unto the Lord; that he might fulfil the word of the Lord, which he spake concerning the house of Eli in Shiloh." He told him he was worthy of death, but he would spare his life for his father's sake, because he suffered with him in Absalom's rebellion: he therefore exiled him to Anathoth, and promoted Zadok to the high-priesthood in his room. —1 Kings 1: 7, 39; 2: 22, 26-27, 35. Now these were representative events. Jehovah will raise up the faithful of the house of Levi, even Zadok and his sons, and they shall walk before the "greater than Solomon" when, in "the city of the Great King," he sits and rules upon his throne as a priest, bearing the glory—Zechariah 6: 12-13, as Prince of Israel for ever. This superior class of Levites "shall come near to me," saith the Lord, "to minister unto me, and they shall stand before me to offer unto me the fat and the blood: they shall enter into my holy place, and they shall come near to my table, to minister unto me, and they shall keep my charge." From the seventeenth verse to the end of this chapter are the ordinances for the lowest class of Levitical priests.

AMENDMENT OF THE OLD COVENANT OF THE KINGDOM.

Here then is a change in the Levitical arrangements, and not an abolition of them. The "service" will be amended, not abolished. In the service under the Mosaic Covenant there were "divers washings;" but in the service under the New Covenant of the kingdom "washings" are omitted; for in the Ezekiel Temple there is no Laver, or brazen sea provided. But sacrifices remain; for eight tables are appointed to be set up in the entry of the north gate on which the lowest class of the priests are to slay them for the people. Paul therefore did not mean that the Levitical service was absolutely and finally discontinued—that it should be revived no more; but that it should be amended to adapt it to the new circumstances created by the sacrifice and high priesthood of Jesus, which was to supersede the priesthood of Aaron.

If we be asked the reason for the conclusion that Paul meant amendment, and not final discontinuance of the Levitical service, we reply, that it is found in the phrase "until the time of reformation" used by him. His words are *mechri kairou diorthoseos*. The Levitical service continued unchanged for forty years after the proclamation of "reformation" by Jesus; so that the *kairos* or definite time for discontinuance was not at his preaching, or even the rending of the temple vail. The Mosaic service was not "imposed until the time of metanoia," which is the word signifying the "reformation" preached. Metanoieite "repent ye," said Jesus. No; it was "imposed until the time of diorthosis," which is not "repentance," but emendation, amendment; from diorthoo to correct, or make right. The subject of the diorthosis is the Mosaic Covenant, not the disposition of men. The Mosaic Constitution must be amended to make way for a new order of priesthood, and a service which shall show forth the perfection of its character. The work of amendment in regard to its foundation was laid in the death and resurrection of Jesus. It then became necessary to gather out of Judah sons for Zadok, and the Prince. "Behold I and the children whom God has given me are for signs and wonders in Israel."—Isaiah 8: 18; Hebrews 2: 13. These children being separated to Jesus from the tribe of Levi and the nation for the purposes to be accomplished through them at "the restitution of all things," nothing remained for that epoch, but to give the Mosaic constitution a thorough shaking. This is called shaking the heaven, and was the fulfilment of the prophecy by Haggai—Haggai 2: 6 reproduced by Paul in his epistle to the Hebrews. —Hebrews 12: 26-27. "Yet once, it is a little while, saith the Lord of hosts, and I will shake the heavens and the earth." The "little

while” was 587 years from the delivery of the prediction; and about ten years from the date of the epistle. It was the last time the nation of Israel and the constitution of their kingdom were to be shaken. Their commonwealth was to be shaken that “the things made,” or constituted, by the Mosaic Covenant, which were incompatible with the rights of the Lord Jesus founded upon “the word of the oath”—Hebrews 7: 21, 28, might be “removed;” and that “those things which” were in harmony with that word, and which “cannot be shaken might remain.” This then was the first stage of the “emendation,” or as the Gentiles would say of “the amendment of the constitution.”

The next work in the carrying out the purpose of emendation is thus expressed in Haggai—“I will shake the sea and the dry land; and I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come; and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts.” When this was spoken the temple was in ruins, the foundation only being laid. The people then returned from Babylon said, “The time has not come that the Lord’s house should be built”—Haggai 1: 2, 4, 9; that is, the 70 years that it was to lie waste from the time its destruction are not yet accomplished, 66 years only having elapsed. But Haggai was sent to them to stir them up to the work, and in four years after, even in the sixth year of the reign of Darius, it was finished. —Ezra 6: 15. When therefore Haggai said, “this house shall be filled with glory” he did not refer to the temple to stand upon the same site which is described by Ezekiel, into which “the glory of the God of Israel,” even the Son of Man in the glory of the Father, “shall come from the way of the east,” and cause the neighbouring earth itself to shine. —Ezekiel 43: 1. This is the only interpretation the prophecy will admit of; for when Jesus came, he was neither “the desire of all nations,” notwithstanding the fanciful gloss upon Virgil’s Pollio, nor was he in glory. The glory of the God of Israel left the temple when the Chaldees were about to destroy it; and it will not return until Jesus shall sit upon his throne and bear the glory in the era of “the regeneration.”

The shaking of the heavens and the earth, as we have said, refers to “the end of all things”—1 Peter 4: 7 constituted by the Old Covenant; but the shaking of the sea and dry land, to the kingdoms of the Gentiles, and is thus explained: “I will overthrow the Throne of Kingdoms, and I will destroy the strength of the kingdoms of the heathen, &c. In that day, saith the Lord of hosts, will I take thee, O Zerubbabel, my servant, the son of Shealtiel, and will make thee as a signet; for I have chosen thee, saith the Lord of hosts.”—Haggai 2: 22. This period of overthrow is “the time of trouble such as there never was since there was a nation to that same time,” when Michael shall stand up, the Great Prince who standeth for the Israelites, and who at that time shall be delivered, even all that shall be found written among the living in Jerusalem. —Daniel 12: 1; Isaiah 4: 3. This is the era of the resurrection of “the heirs” of “the kingdom which cannot be moved.” Michael (Mi-who cha-like, el God) the great power of God, even Jesus, the great Prince of Israel, appears at this crisis “to subdue all things to himself,” and to complete the work of emendation. He smites the image of Nebuchadnezzar upon its feet—Daniel 2: 34, and grinds its fragments to powder—Matthew 21: 44. He brings the king of the north, who is Head over an extensive region, (rosh al-eretz ravbah) to his end—Daniel 11: 45; Psalm 110: 6. He causes Gog to fall upon the mountains of Israel—Ezekiel 39: 4; and expels the Gentiles out of his land—Psalm 10: 16, that they may tread his holy city under foot no more. Having made the nations lick the dust like a serpent—Micah 7: 16-17, and bound their power as with a mighty chain—Revelation 20: 1-3, he proceeds in the building again of the tabernacle of David, and in the setting up of its ruins—that is, in the restoring again of the kingdom of God to Israel, or in “the

restitution of all things” belonging to the Mosaic law, compatible with his exercise of the functions of High Priest in Israel. When this work is accomplished the diorthosis or emendation will be complete.

If the Mosaic Covenant of the kingdom had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second—Hebrews 8: 7. The priesthood of the Mosaic was changeable, passing from father to son. This was deemed by the Lord a very important defect, which must therefore be amended. He determined therefore that the priesthood should be changed—that it should no longer “be left to other people;” but should be unchangeable in the hands of Messiah and the saints, or Zadok and his sons. But this purpose could not be carried into effect so long as the Mosaic constitution of the kingdom continued in force; for this restricted the priesthood to the tribe of Levi, and made no provision for a priest of the tribe of Judah. Now Jehovah purposed that the High Priesthood of the nation should be changed from the tribe of Levi and the family of Aaron, to the tribe of Judah and the family of David. Hence this change of the priesthood being determined, there was decreed of necessity a change also of the law—Hebrews 7: 12. As Christ’s priesthood was not authorised by the Mosaic Covenant, something was necessary on which to found it. This necessity was provided for in the Word of the Oath which runs thus—“I have sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the Order of Melchizedec.” This oath was uttered by Jehovah upwards of 500 years after the Law was given from Sinai; and constitutes the right of David’s son to the priesthood of the kingdom; as the oath sworn to David also entitles his son to its throne for ever. The grand peculiarity, then, of the New Constitution of the kingdom over the Old is, the union of the High priesthood and kingly office in one person, of the tribe of Judah and family of David unchangeably, or for ever. Under the Mosaic, the priesthood and royalty of the kingdom were separate, and restricted to two distinct families and tribes—the priesthood, to Levi and Aaron; the royalty, to Judah and David. But this will be amended, and the Lord Jesus, in whose veins once flowed the blood of Levi, Aaron, * Judah and David, will unite in himself the kingly and priestly offices, when he sits and rules upon his throne and bears the glory.

* * *

* (Luke 1: 5, 36. Elizabeth and Mary were cousins; and Elizabeth a daughter of Aaron; their mothers were sisters. Hence Mary’s blood was Aaronic from her mother, and Davidic from her father Heli. Jesus therefore partook of both maternally.)

* * *

Well, Jesus of Nazareth was manifested to Israel as son of God at his baptism. It was clearly proved that he was the Christ, and therefore entitled to the things defined in the word of the oaths to himself and his father David. But “he was made under the law”—Galatians 4: 4, to which he yielded a perfect obedience in all things. He never entered the Court of the Priests, nor the Holy Place; nor attempted to do service at the altar. Being of the tribe of Judah, the Law forbid him to advance beyond the Court of the Israelites, or to minister in holy things. So long as the Mosaic law continued in practical operation, and he inhabited the land, he must have remained among the people. Had Israel continued in their country under the law to this day, and Jesus had remained with them until now, and they had been willing to acknowledge him, and submit to his government, he would not have ascended the throne until the constitution was dedicated and amended: “for,” says Paul, in view of this condition of affairs, “If he were on earth, he should not be a Priest, seeing that there are Priests that offer gifts according to the law”—Hebrews 8: 4. The emendation of the covenant must have been preceded by its dedication. This could only

be accomplished by the death of the mediatorial testator; for no testament or covenant is of force while the testator liveth—Hebrews 9: 16-17. Jehovah is the testator, but being incapable of death, his will, or covenant, was ordained in the hand of a mediator, who became Jehovah's substitutionary testator. As Jesus, the Heir of God, was to inherit under the New, or amended, Covenant having root in the promises, his death was necessitated; for the covenant in which his rights were vested was of no force till he died and rose again. His death was therefore the dedication of the covenant in his blood; as he himself said, "This cup is the New Covenant in my blood which is shed for many for the remission of sins"—Matthew 26: 26; Luke 22: 20—and to show the connexion between the covenant and the kingdom, said, "I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come." But when he came to life again after this dedication, he could not even then inherit the kingdom. The Mosaic Covenant must have been changed; an emendation, however, to which the party in power would by no means consent, as the amendment would have put them all out of the government. Pilate, and Herod, Caiaphas and the Council must have surrendered their offices into the hands of Jesus, who would have promoted in their place his own disciples and friends. But they would not hear of such a thing; therefore it remained only for Jesus to absent himself, and to abolish the kingdom until the time appointed in the wisdom of the Father for its restitution to Israel under a better, more permanent, and perfect order of things.

JEWES AND GENTILES IN RELATION TO THE NEW COVENANT AND THE BLOOD THEREOF.

We come now to the consideration of the difficulty seemingly involved in Paul's doctrine when regarded in the light of Ezekiel's testimony. Jesus is now the High Priest of God, and the only one that exists, or will ever exist in relation to man. He has had no rival since the Mosaic Covenant "vanished away." He is God's high priest for those, both Jews and Gentiles, who have been reconciled to God through his name—that is, who believe God's promises concerning the kingdom, and the things concerning Jesus, and have been united to his name by baptism. This is equivalent to saying, who have been reconciled through the belief and obedience of the gospel of the kingdom—through the obedience of faith. Of the things concerning Jesus are the things pertaining to his divine sonship, his spotless and unblemished character, his sacrificial death and resurrection, &c., constituting him God's Lamb, holy and without blemish, having neither spot, nor wrinkle, or any such thing, of his own free will once offered to bear the sins of many. Thus he was at once the sacrifice and the priest; for "he offered up himself; as he said, "I lay down my life for the sheep. Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it up again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it up again. This commandment have I received of my Father."—Hebrews 7: 27; John 10: 15, 17-18. Being thus the Lamb slain, he resumed his life, and entered into the presence of God before whom he stands as the blood-sprinkled Ark of the Covenant—Revelation 11: 19, in whom is deposited the Law hereafter to go forth from Zion, and the life of his sheep—Colossians 3: 3, whose sins he bears away—Hebrews 9: 28; and thus they are sanctified by the dedicated covenant through the once offering of his body: so that "by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified"—Hebrews 10: 10, 14.

Now these sanctified ones are a purified people, whose "hearts," or minds and dispositions, have been "purified by faith"—Acts 15: 9—faith in the promises of God, and in "the blood of

sprinkling which speaks better things than the blood of Abel.” The blood of Jesus is the blood of sprinkling which gushed forth from his side as “an offering” or purification “for sin.” The poor in spirit and the meek, the honest and good hearts, that by faith appreciate the virtue of this sprinkled blood, and have become the subjects of repentance and remission in his name, are said to be “sprinkled from an evil conscience,” and to have “washed the body with pure water”—Hebrews 10: 22. They are “the children of the promise,” or covenant; because in becoming Christ’s they have believed the promises, and been purified by “the blood of the covenant.” As yet they walk by faith in the things believed, and not by sight. Faith, which is “the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things unseen,” is the mirror which reflects the things of the approaching future, and presents them to the believer’s mind as though he were beholding, and personally in the presence of, the very things themselves. Hence, it is said to such, “Ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the City of the living God, to Jerusalem the heavenly, and to myriads of angels, to a general convocation even to an assembly of first-borns enrolled for the heavens (en ouranois) and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of the just made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the New Covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling which speaks better things than that of Abel”—Hebrews 12: 22—ye are come by faith to these things, which at present ye do dimly contemplate; but which ye shall see no longer as through a glass darkly, but face to face in the presence of the Lord.

Now these, whose hearts are sprinkled and their bodies washed, are the only people on the earth since the entrance of Jesus into the presence of God, for whom he officiates as “High Priest over the House of God”—Hebrews 10: 21; 3: 6. They are “God’s temple,” “the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man”—Hebrews 8: 2. For forty years this temple coexisted with that in Jerusalem; but since the destruction of the latter it is the only temple of God upon the earth, where gifts and offerings, called “spiritual sacrifices”—1 Peter 2: 5, 9, are offered acceptably to his name. They become acceptable in being presented through Jesus Christ. They who do the worship (and they are all the faithful) enter into this holy place, or heavenly, which as a whole they constitute, with the sprinkled blood of the covenant upon their hearts. Purified once through faith in the blood sprinkled covenant of promise, hereafter to become the law of the kingdom, there is in their case no more sacrifice for sin; “for by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.” Yet, though thus sanctified, they continue to offer spiritual sacrifices. All this is worshipping the Father in spirit and in truth; which is the only service acceptable to him while his kingdom is in ruins, and prostrate at the feet of the Gentiles.

But this worship in spirit and in truth, expressed in confession of the hope, —Hebrews 10: 23 (Homologia tes elpidos, confession of the hope, and not “profession of our faith,” as in the king’s version.) & Romans 10: 9-10— &c. praise, and prayer; in baptism; and in eating and drinking of the symbols on the table of the Lord, is the unburdensome privilege of those only who through faith in the Covenant and its blood have become “heirs of the kingdom.” When this is set up in Palestine, the service is changed in form, but not in principle; and from social becomes national. In the national service, the higher priesthood, which consists of Jesus and the “children God has given him,” all immortal by resurrection or transformation, though they offer the fat and the blood, it is for the people and not for themselves. They need no more sacrifice for sin; but being “priests unto God”—Revelation 5: 10, there needs must be something for them to offer on account of the worshippers for whom they officiate. The New Covenant, which we now accept as a matter of faith and hope, has not yet been made with the House of Judah and Israel. If

it had, they would now be a united nation in Palestine. It will be made with them when they are grafted into their own olive and not before. At the engrafting, there will be a great national celebration, called “a delivering of the Covenant”—Ezekiel 20: 37—be-masoreth ha-berith—A delivering of the New Covenant from Zion—Micah 4: 2, with a glorious, but not such a terrible, display of power as when the Covenant was delivered from Sinai. The nation, or Twelve Tribes, having been brought at length to acknowledge Jesus as High Priest and king, are received into favor; and being under the New Covenant, as in former years they were under the Old, Jehovah becomes merciful to their unrighteousness, and proclaims everlasting oblivion of all their past individual and national offences by virtue of the royal blood of the Covenant, the preciousness of which they then perceive and appreciate. This amnesty, however, benefits that generation only to which the Covenant is delivered and by which it is accepted. It affects not the generations of Israel’s rebellious dead; they are the “cut off from the people.”

Now, the question remains, when thus reconciled to God through the blood of his Son, is the nation to have a religious service or worship; and if they are, what is to be its principle, and what its form? No one who understands the Bible would affirm, that the Twelve Tribes of Israel were to live in their own land under the New Covenant for 1000 years without any national religious worship. To affirm this would be to say in effect, that God had prepared a Royal Priesthood for his kingdom, but had provided no service for them to perform. This is inadmissible for a moment. There will be a service under the New Covenant as there was under the Old. Its principle will be memorial, not typical; even the extension of the principle upon which is now celebrated the death and resurrection of Jesus. Hence, the “reconciliation” will be a memorial reconciliation made perfect by the blood of the Covenant which institutes it. The reconciliation of the Old Covenant was typical and imperfect; because the dedication blood, being merely that of bulls and goats could not perfect the conscience in taking away of sins. When the Prince under the New Covenant “prepares for himself, and for all the people of the land a bullock for a sin-offering—Ezekiel 45: 22, it is memorial of his own sacrifice of himself, and memorial of the reconciliation which the people enjoy through the blood of the Covenant with which, through faith in it, their hearts will be sprinkled then, as the true believers are at present.

Such is the principle of the amended “service which pertains to the Israelites”—Romans 9: 4. The form thereof is detailed in Ezekiel more at large than we can present it here. It is a service not of spiritual sacrifices, but of bloody sacrifices of spiritual significance. The lower order of the priesthood, mortal Levites, slay them for the people, and pass the fat and blood from the tables at the north gate to the Altar, where they are burned and sprinkled by the higher or immortal priests, “the seed of Zadok,” before the Lord. The past sins of the nation having been amnestied at the delivering of the Covenant, there is thenceforth no more remembrance of sins once a year. The old Mosaic annual atonement on the tenth day of the seventh month, at which the tribes were to “afflict their souls,” is not revived under the New Covenant. It will form no part of the service then. It was one of those things made, or appointed, that was removed when the Lord shook the Mosaic heaven by the Roman power. There will be no Laver of water between the Temple and the Altar for the seed of Zadok to wash themselves before they enter the temple. These washings and carnal ordinances are also abolished; for those who approach the altar and enter in, are like their Prince, holy and undefiled, being devoid of evil in the flesh.

Much more might be said upon these interesting and important matters, but we must at present refrain. Knowing the ignorance that prevails upon the subject here exhibited, we did not feel at liberty to answer our beloved sister's letter in fewer words. We have endeavoured to unfold what has been revealed as the best exhibition of the agreement between the prophets and the apostles. The reader being now, therefore, in possession of the premises, will be able to draw many more conclusions for himself than at present occur, or can be conveniently reported at this time.

EDITOR.

* * *

OUR VISIT TO BRITAIN.

(Continued from page 222.)

From Derby we proceeded to Lincoln, an old cathedral town. There is there a small congregation of friends to the truth, who with a disposition to benefit their contemporaries, find Satan too strong for their endeavours. Lincoln is one of the thrones of his kingdom, being the metropolis of the well-endowed See of one of the "Right Reverend Fathers in God" of the State Religion. The cathedral is a large and ancient pile, standing upon an eminence which commands an extensive view of the surrounding country. It is a work of the middle ages, and decorated with scattered emblems which illustrate the grossness and devilishness of the times that witnessed its foundation. Over one of its principal gates is a brutal representation of the Serpent tempting Eve in the garden of Eden; and upon another part of the building projecting from a parapet is a woman with the devil on her back looking over Lincoln. This must certainly be the presiding deity of the place. The temple is bedevilled and be-grimmed with sculptures of hideous grimace. The devil-worshippers of the east would certainly feel themselves at home, as in the very abiding place of this world's god, were they transported to the episcopal area of "Old Tom of Lincoln." They never would imagine that they beheld a house of the God of Israel, where his humble and contrite worshippers convened to worship him in spirit and in truth. Such an idea would be unsearchable, for there is nothing connected with the huge revolting structure having the remotest affinity with the truth. It was an old Romish temple of the saints well adapted to the dark superstition of the times. To the antiquarian it is interesting in an archaeological point of view; and to the Bishop and his body-guards it is useful and profitable because of the rich endowments which pertain to it; but by the people it is deserted as a place of worship, for there are no utterances there that speak to the intellect or heart of man. Strangers visit it as they visit the old Roman arch and wall, as one of the lions of the place. It is a gloomy sepulchre of the soul; an earthly habitation of the mouldering dead, where also the dead in trespasses and sins, in tones of heart-freezing monotony, draw forth the untouching diurnal formalism of the "Common Prayer Book" as indispensable to the monopoly and enjoyment of the loaves and fishes.

The clerical influence is strong in Lincoln, because both aristocratic and wealthy; and wherever rank and riches are concentrated in a third rate town the people are servile and timid. The dissenters are not bold in Lincoln; because being of the trading and humbler classes, they fear to offend the clerical power lest their interests should perish. We obtained a tolerable hearing at first in the Council Chamber; but when our teaching was found to be subversive of the state superstition, and of nonconformist divinity, it was found impossible to bring them out. The Unitarian minister was quite captivated for a time with what he heard. He attended nearly all our lectures, and urged us to publish them for the public good. He invited us to his house, where we

passed a very agreeable evening with him and his family; and also visited us at the friend's with whom we sojourned. He was quite stirred up to the study of the prophets, upon whose writings, as far as fulfilled, he delivered a course of lectures when we had departed. After we had concluded our lectures, he arose, and thanked us in a speech addressed to the audience for our labors in Lincoln. The things he had heard took such hold of his mind that he could not sleep. He said he got up one night, and sat examining the prophets for three hours on the things we had been discussing. His lectures on fulfilled prophecy were the result of this. Whether he will come to a full understanding of the truth so as to be moved to the obedience which the faith demands of all who would inherit the kingdom of God, we can only say, we hope he will. "My poverty and not my will consents" is a sentiment which doubtless explains the aberrations of a multitude from the paths of rectitude and life. They would do the truth only their necessities, or their love of popularity, or their supposed worldly interests, prevent. Thousands would embrace the truth if it involved no loss of friends, or worldly advantages; but the idea of suffering the loss of all things, or forsaking all, and following the truth through evil and good report—of taking the spoiling of their goods with joy in hope of promises to be fulfilled—the sacrifice is too great, and not to be ventured on even for the recompense of eternal life and glory! Oh, what accursed foolishness is this! For what shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world, and lose his life! Well might Jesus say, "beware of covetousness;" for he who covets the present world, and seeks its wealth and honor for himself and children, is an idolator—Ephesians 5: 5, and can as easily inherit the kingdom of God as a camel can pass through a needle's eye. "Little children keep yourselves from idols."

We spent a very pleasant time in this town in a family much attached to Mr. Wallis and devoted to the Bethanian theory. Some of them were quite opposed to our being invited to Lincoln; but when they came to hear for themselves, the tables were completely turned, and they were as unwilling for us to leave. Two were immersed while we sojourned there. We left them increased in knowledge, if not renewed. This is less easy to accomplish than to enlighten. It requires time; for the creation of the human character after the image of the invisible God is neither instantaneous nor miraculous.

While lecturing at Lincoln several members of a Bethanian congregation in Newark came over to hear us. They appear to have been much gratified at what they heard; and consequently very desirous for us to visit Newark. The whole of the active and influential members were canvassed, and a unanimous wish to hear was the result. They accordingly went to Mr. John Bell, the Manager of the Bank there, and elder of their congregation, to ascertain whether an official invitation could not be forwarded to us, "that they might have the pleasure of hearing more particularly concerning the things we testified about the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ." Prior to this visit to Mr. B. they had made arrangements for our "comfortable accommodation." Mr. Bell, however, replied that from the disorderly position we occupied in visiting England without an official recommendation, he could not sanction it; and that as he was one of the committee appointed at Chester to regulate the affairs of "evangelists" from America, he could not throw off his allegiance to said committee in officially introducing us to Newark without their consent. To this it was objected that we were not an "evangelist." He replied that he could not have fellowship with us, and so exhibit ingratitude towards his brethren at Nottingham, and towards Messrs. Campbell and Henshall for their valuable services. He consented, however, that they should have the room in which they ordinarily convened for us to lecture in. Finding

they could do no better, they availed themselves of this permission in forwarding to us the following note:

Newark, August 31, 1848.

Dear Brother:

We the undersigned being members of the church of Christ here, beg most gratefully to acknowledge, and to thank you for your generous offer to come and declare unto us “the things concerning the kingdom of God.” We are very anxious you should come, but the result of an interview of the subscribed with our respected elder, Mr. Bell, causes us very much regret that the church (that is, Mr. Bell) cannot for certain reasons give you an official invitation. We, rather than incur any grievous consequences, must forego the pleasure which we had strongly and anxiously anticipated.

We beg to express our highest approval of the nature of your valuable services in the cause of truth. We are yours in the Hope of the Gospel

Very affectionately,

JAMES LUXFORD,
CHARLES TAYLOR,
JOHN HAGE,
DAVIS JOHNSON,
EVERETT ALLENBY,
GEORGE DOUBLEDAY.

Things remained thus until our return to Lincoln from Scotland in November. At that time an intimation was forwarded to us that the friends at Newark would be glad to receive us, and that their room would be at our service all the week with the exception of the first day. The way being thus open we made our appearance there, and addressed the people on three or four successive nights. The room was crowded to excess, and Mr. Bell was there. His attentions were polite and friendly, notwithstanding his allegiance to the committee, and gratitude to his allies elsewhere. Having an appointment at Lincoln we left on Saturday morning. But before our departure Mr. Bell surprised us by a visit of adieu. He said he had nothing to do with bringing us there, but he was very glad we had come, and to prove that he meant what he said, begged our acceptance of a trifle towards our expenses, which must be considerable. Next time, said he, you must write to me, and I will make all necessary arrangements for your comfort, and for the accommodation of the public. When, therefore, we proposed to revisit Newark in 1849, we wrote to Mr. Bell as he requested. The following was his reply.

Newark, 28 June, 1849.

Bro. Thomas:

Dear Sir—Your letter with programme is to hand. I have applied for a more eligible building in which to hold the meetings you propose to convene. I cannot obtain an answer for this post, but may do so tomorrow. At all events our old meeting place will be available for your lectures should we be prevented from obtaining more desirable accommodation; and therefore you must stand engaged for the period named in your programme, and in a day or two when my

arrangements are complete, I will write you again. At present the public will expect you to appear on Sunday, July 7.

I am, dear sir,

Very faithfully yours,

JOHN BELL.

Accordingly in two or three days we received the following note.

Newark, 1 July, 1849.

Dear Brother:

I enclose to you a bill which we have struck off announcing the lectures. I shall expect your arrival on Saturday, and have provided for you your old quarters. I do so because I think you will feel more independent, &c. At the same time you will allow me to say that my house will always be open for your reception, and for your retreat; and I hope whilst you are in Newark you will come and take your seat with me at my table whenever you are able.

I shall meet you (D. V.) on your arrival at the station; but should any unforeseen circumstance arise to prevent me, my brother will supply my lack of service.

I would just observe that our Corn Exchange, where you are to lecture, is a beautiful large room, and I trust you will not sustain any inconvenience as that experienced during your last visit to Newark.

I am, dear sir,

Very sincerely and affectionately yours,

JOHN BELL.

P. S. —I intend to strike off a small bill announcing the publication of *Elpis Israel*, which I shall take care to have distributed after each of the week day lectures as the people retire at the doors.

J. B.

These letters show that what Mr. Bell had heard, had produced an entire change in his views concerning us. He had evidently renounced his allegiance to the Chester committee, and ceased to be grateful to Messrs. Campbell and Henshall for their alleged “valuable services.” Unfortunately, however, we saw Mr. Bell no more, or we might have strengthened his new born zeal, and have given a different turn to his future course. He failed to meet us at the station on our arrival. He had fallen sick, and was so severely afflicted that his physician recommended that no visitors should be admitted to his room. We accordingly left the town without an interview; and to our great astonishment heard that some time after his recovery, Mr. Bell had abandoned “reformation” in despair, and had cast himself into the fascinating embraces of the Harlot Church of England!

* * *

The moment of parting is, perhaps, the first moment that we feel how useful we have been to each other. The natural reserve of the heart is broken and the moved spirit speaks as it feels.

* * *

HERALD
OF THE
KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.

RICHMOND, AUGUST, 1851

“DOING GOOD”

In Louisa things went off smoothly enough. There was no clique there of the old colonial superstition to nail up the windows and bar the doors of the meeting house as in Hanover. Meeting was held at “Temperance” during three days. The things of the kingdom of God and name of Jesus Christ were laid before the people, who, if the attention they gave to what they heard be a criterion, were much interested in what they listened to. Some of them concluded that if the Bible were true, the things exhibited to them must be the truth; and of course if true, convicted the preachers of the popular gospels of being retailers of crude and undigested notions, the fables of old wives, to the utter bewilderment of all who gave heed to them, and to the annihilation of the testimony of God. This is unquestionable. For, if what we demonstrate from the prophets and apostles be the truth (and where is the man here or beyond the sea can convict it of error) the theories of all sects without distinction must be fabulous. This is the ground we stand upon; this is the impregnable position we occupy: it may be assailed, but it cannot be carried by assault. If we are right, then all else are wrong. There is no middle, no neutral ground between us and those who differ from us. If the things they preach for gospel be indeed “the gospel of the kingdom of God,” we are altogether out of the way—we are blind darkeners of counsel by words without knowledge. If one understand the things we teach, how can he rationally confess that we advocate the truth, and fraternize with those who believe and teach the opposite? This is at once to declare that truth is error, and error, truth. That is, with his tongue he confesses we are right, but in his deeds declares his conviction that we are wrong. This is the faith of Demas, who believed with the apostles and walked with their enemies, having a heartfelt devotion to the present world, and a disrelish for the reproach which is inseparable from a valiant profession and defence of the truth. Such amiable fainthearts are neither wise nor prudent before God; and whenever the wounds of the enemy are found upon them they are invariably in their backs, for which there is no defence in “the whole armour of God;” for “no man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God”—Luke 9: 62. Such timid “lovers of the truth,” who would follow Jesus, if he would only let them first go bid them farewell who are at home, adjudge themselves to be unworthy of eternal life—Acts 13: 46. When, therefore, they go over to the enemy, they go, like the money-loving soul merchant who sold his Lord for thirty pieces of silver, to “their own place” where kindred spirits dwell. Thus the circumstances which grow out of the truth and its relations to men and things, make manifest those who are on the Lord’s side, and who against him.

“How many converts,” said one, “were there made at Temperance?” The respondent answered that he did not know of any. “What!” exclaimed the astonished Bethanist, “a three days meeting and three speakers there, and not one immersed, who ever heard of such a thing!” “I believe I have read of a more remarkable case than that somewhere in the scripture,” said a stander-by.

“Ah! I should like to know it,” said the doctor. “Well, didn’t Noah preach a hundred years, and not make a convert in all that time?” “True, true, he certainly did; I never thought of that.” This incident well illustrates the notion prevalent among sectaries, who imagine that “no good” is done unless men, women, or children are dipped in water, or brought to join the church,” as the result of “a big meeting!” Such a consequence of preaching is styled “the progress of the gospel,” which is supposed to have made astonishing advance if a few tens, under the excitement of the hour, can be persuaded that they have “got religion,” or religion has got them, which is probably the same thing in the vocabulary of Ashdod! These fervid specimens of “piety” labor to subdue the moral wilderness upon a principle of instantaneity, that is, of hewing down the trees, grubbing up the land, burning the logs, sowing, reaping, and harvesting all at once. A farmer who would piously or seriously expect to accomplish this would be esteemed a fool; yet such is the expectation of those who affect to judge of the good we do by the results that immediately follow. They exercise their reason so little upon spiritual things that they do not discern that there must be in the cultivation and improvement of the human mind as well as in that of the soil, “a time for all things;” a time to plough, a time to sow, a time to grow, and a time to reap what is sown. Society must be prepared for the casting in among them of the incorruptible seed—1 Peter 1: 23, 25—or word of the kingdom—Matthew 13: 19; James 1: 18; 2: 5. It is the nature of this seed to vegetate to perfection only in honest and good hearts; and even when it falls into these, it must have time to grow that the increase may be of God—1 Corinthians 3: 6-7. A congregation of a thousand may not contain an honest and good heart in all the multitude; yet it may contain many way side, stony, and thorny-hearted hearers. You might sow the word of the kingdom among such as these forever, and no good could by possibility result: but sow tares, and, the soil being well adapted to their growth, they would in a night spring up luxuriantly. The production of such a crop would be styled “doing good,” the progress of the gospel and so forth, by the tare sowers themselves; while they could only be regarded as the work of an enemy by those who understand the truth. This is the difference between our doings and the deeds of our opponents. We sow the word of the kingdom in declaring the testimony of God—1 Corinthians 2: 1, and reasoning with the people concerning it—Acts 17: 2; 18: 4. Having done this, we exhort them to search the prophets and apostles to see if the things presented be not as we have declared them. If we can get them to do this in earnest, we have no anxiety for the result. The increase will come, in some cases sooner, in others, later; and when it comes it will be God’s increase, and not ours. The process, we grant, is slow and undazzling; but it is sure, and the fruit is worth gathering when matured. Conviction does not usually blaze upon the human mind like a flash of lightning; it steals upon us, as it were, like a thief in the night. By keeping the mind upon the truth, it is at length taken captive by it. You cannot take man’s intellect and heart by storm. It is hardened by the tempest, but is melted by the genial influences of the truth. We teach the doctrine of baptism indeed, but we urge no man to be baptised, knowing assuredly, that when one comes to understand the word of the kingdom, and that word has acquired the ascendancy, and exerts a proper influence over him, he will demand to be baptised, that he may be united to the name of Jesus, through which name alone he expects to receive—Acts 5: 31; 10: 43; 11: 18—repentance, remission of sins, and a title to eternal life—John 20: 31. A man who needs goading into the water, as “evangelists” and “pastors” work upon them, is not fit for baptism, any more than a daughter of Eve is fit to be wedded to a man who has to be dragged to the altar of Hymen to pronounce the words “I will.” Were she left to her own purpose she would never meet him there, and therefore ought not. If a man have faith, he will cast away his crutch and walk, leaping and praising God; and according to his faith, so will it be to him hereafter, when he shall receive the

sentence of Christ. If he have believed and obeyed the gospel of the kingdom, and walked worthy of it, he will possess the kingdom with everlasting life; but if he have received some other “gospel” which is not of God, he will get nothing; for what a man sows that he will assuredly reap in due season. If we believe in an unpromised nonentity, we shall reap nonentity; but if we believe what God has promised, and conform to the conditions he has proposed, we shall obtain the things believed. This is “sowing to the Spirit” of whom we shall reap everlasting life—Galatians 6: 8.

But sectarian theologians do not operate upon these principles. Their work is to enlarge the borders of their several “Zions,” upon the supposition that they are “saving souls.” With them “to do good” is to prosper in this labor. If it be a Zion in the midst of the water, the great effort is to get men, women, and children into the water that they may enter the kingdom, that is, the church! In listening to such “laborers in the vineyard” you would suppose that there was nothing in the gospel but water; while another set of “laborers” would leave you to conjecture whether water had any thing to do with the gospel at all! That men are sinners, and will be damned in hell fire and brimstone at death, if they don’t repent and believe the traditions they teach, is the burden of their proclamation. They emblazon the damnation with “tongues set on fire of hell,” and with their death-bed tales, and dreams of torment, scare the weak and timid of both sexes and of all ages into “the horrors,” from which they are taught there is no escape except through the instrumentality of their prescription. And what is the remedy? Prayer for the Holy Ghost that they may be baptised with it and with fire, so that by its influence they may get religion, or be converted! And how do they know that they have “got religion” in answer to this prayer? By feeling or “experiencing a hope” that their sins are forgiven them! Animal excitement having subsided the tranquillity that ensues is construed into conversion, and thus the subject deceives himself and is deceived. But all the clerics do not agree in the prescription. The dissidents tell their patients that prayer is unnecessary in the case; and that all they have to do is to believe that Jesus is the Son and Christ of God, and be baptised for the remission of sins. This throws cold water upon “the horrors,” and does away with the uncertainty of an answer to prayer. It also converts the patient into a combatant, and the “high-minded,” “intelligent,” “nature’s nobleman” is immersed off-hand to show his contempt for the revival excesses of his contemporaries! This is the general scope of religionism in this country, and constitutes “the good” so much trumpeted throughout the land. Yes, you hear of the multitudes that are dipped in water, but you hear nothing of the apostates, whose name is legion, who run for a few weeks or months, and then return to their own place two-fold more the sons of capture and destruction than before. The country abounds in such religionists as these whose immersions were published to the world as conquests of the gospel, aye of the ancient gospel; as moss gathered around the stone that began to strike the image on the feet on Pentecost, and which still rolling onwards conquering and to conquer, is heaping Ossa on Pelion, and will soon become a great mountain and fill the whole earth! Nonsense. If the stone never became the Mountain until it have attained that magnitude by the ministrations of gospellers who are the producers of such fruits as we have indicated, that glorious promise will never become a fact, and God’s truth will be impeached. The “good” these men plume themselves in doing is downright evil. Instead of moving heaven and earth to get men into the water, and then leaving them to themselves, their great aim ought to be to enlighten them in the testimony of God, which would then do all the rest. But this is a work impracticable for them. Being ignorant of the truth, and too wise in their own conceits to learn, they follow after their own ways, and glorify their own thoughts which are only evil and that continually.

The meeting at Temperance was very numerously attended on Lord's day, the house being too small to hold the people. There were two addresses with an interval for refreshment between each. None were dipped in water, but an impression was left on the minds of several, some of whom had been immersed and others not, in regard to the gospel of the kingdom, which is extremely probable will ripen into that obedience of the truth which can be yielded only by them who understand and believe it. The baptism of such will be doing good; but until such "disciples" can be prepared, all baptisms are to be deprecated as doing more harm than good.

* * *

THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM HEARD WITH LIVELY INTEREST AND RESPECT.

Our absence during three weeks nearly on the affairs of the Kingdom will account for the later appearance of the last Herald than usual. We had the pleasure, in company with brethren Anderson and Magruder, of "reasoning out of the scriptures"—Acts 17: 2—with a large assembly of the people of Acquinton, King William county, Va. Meetings were held at this colonial temple during three days. The word of the kingdom was sown in earnestness and hope. The attention of the hearers was commanded by the weight and authority of the truths discussed; indeed, men and women whose minds cannot be rivetted by the testimonies of God concerning the approaching conflict of nations, the destruction of the governments of the world, the resurrection of the saints in glory, honor, incorruptible life, and dominion, the restoration of the kingdom again to Israel, and the reign of the Lord Jesus and his brethren on the thrones of the house of David, over the Twelve Tribes and the subject nations for a thousand years—such persons, we say, are only fit for the holiday slaves of mammon, and to perish with the unreasoning beasts they drive. We were gratified at the attention given. As it is at present, we could expect no more. The proclamation we make is too startling, too entirely subversive of the popular religions, too completely at variance with the creed and college divinity which veils, deludes, and darkens the public mind, to do more at present than to stagger and amaze. The people are not yet sufficiently familiar with the testimony, calmly, teachably, and unbiassedly to weigh and examine its claims upon their self-immolation to its authority. This will come hereafter to some extent, especially when they see those who profess to believe it submit themselves heartily to the obedience it requires. This is the period of transition—a time of passing out of darkness into light, and from the power of the adversary to God. A knowledge of the truth can only begin and complete the work; for by knowledge the intellectual and moral nature, or "soul and spirit," the heart of man, is alone renewed after the divine image of Him that created him—Colossians 3: 10. The truth contained in the promises, fulfilled and unfulfilled, is the formative power which begets, develops, and makes manifest "the New Creature"—Galatians 6: 15; 2 Corinthians 5: 17. All we can do is to exhibit it, prove it, make it plain; the testimony which sustains it must do the rest. This was our course at Acquinton; the rest we leave to God.

From this neighbourhood we journeyed to the lower end of King and Queen. There has been residing there for several years past a self-excised member of the Methodist church. From some cause or other he took it into his head to read the bible for himself. The effect of this unusual determination soon became manifest. He found that the system of doctrine, called Methodism,

which he had all along supposed was the very truth itself, was nowhere to be found in the scriptures. The result was that he began to give utterance to what he believed; and to proclaim that his brethren, and indeed the religious world at large, were altogether gone out of the way; and that their faiths were not the gospel of salvation. Conversing one day with a friend upon these matters, he learned from him that he was not alone in his views. He lent him a number of the Herald, where to his surprise and gratification he found them advocated at large. He became a subscriber to the paper, and by its assistance was enabled more effectively to agitate for the truth. This he has done with considerable success, proving that if there be but one man in a neighbourhood who believes, he can, if in earnest, excite considerable attention to the truth.

There is a colonial temple about three miles below Little Plymouth called the Old Church. By some accident its interior was destroyed by fire, either before or after (we are uncertain which) it fell into the hands of the Methodists, for though it was “possessed” by Uncle Sam for the benefit of all his nephews, a few of the cousins have managed to monopolise it, very much to the displeasure of their Baptist relations, who claimed an equal right to it; but not being able to establish it, owing to some quibble of the law, they erected Mount Olivet for themselves hard by. A subscription was taken up for the repair of the house by the Methodists. Our friend agreed to subscribe twenty-five dollars to be paid in work upon the building on condition that we might speak there whenever we visited the county. He also stipulated, that if they should refuse the house they were to pay him twenty-five dollars for the work done; and at all events to allow us the use of it for the appointments of one visit certain. These terms were agreed to; and by virtue of them, we were invited to hold meeting there the first convenient opportunity; which happened on Wednesday and Thursday the 16th and 17th of July.

After a hot drive of twenty miles we arrived at the Old Church between 11 and 12 o’clock. We were agreeably disappointed in finding quite a large gathering of the people awaiting our arrival. This was the result of the agitation which had preceded us. We soon found that immortality and Baptism were the questions which stirred up the people; for we were requested by some of the members of the Methodist body, through our friend, to address them on “the Immortality of the Soul;” while certain of the Baptists also wished us to say something about baptism. We endeavoured to oblige both parties. On the first day, we discoursed on Life and Incorruptibility brought to light by Jesus Christ in the gospel of the kingdom. We stated the theory concocted by the heathen before Christ came, and adopted by the New Platonists, who sprung up in the apostolic churches from the tares which the enemy had scattered among them. We endeavoured to exhibit this as it is taught in the papal and protestant theologies, impartially and without extenuation. We then showed what the Bible taught upon the subject, that by the contrast the truth might shine forth more conspicuously. The things discussed held the people in profound attention upwards of two hours. In dismissing the audience, Mr. Magruder made some concluding remarks, which were followed by a question from a class-leader, who wished to know, if his soul and body would lie in the grave when he was dead? He put other questions as difficulties in the way of our positions, founded upon the hackneyed texts usually quoted by the Platonists of the age in support of their mythology, such as “kill the body, but cannot kill the soul,” “the rich man and Lazarus,” “absent from the body, present with the Lord,” “the thief upon the cross,” &c. Mr. Magruder replied to some of the questions, and we also to one or two, although he demurred to us as being able to prove any thing we pleased! As our friend the leader seemed to be in the spirit of interminable inquiry, we concluded to cut the matter short for the

present, and to meet an hour sooner on the morrow to look further into it. This being agreed to, we dispersed to our several abodes.

We reassembled at 11 A.M. with an undiminished congregation. A string of texts was handed in by the leader, which would have furnished matter enough for a series of fashionable sermons for several months. He wished us simply to explain them by scripture without reasoning. This was an impossibility we could not undertake. He wanted scripture, not reason; we required both as more scriptural and apostolic. We occupied about an hour in examining some of his texts, and turned over the remainder to Mr. Magruder to make what disposition of them he found convenient in the afternoon. We then proceeded to address them on “the Great Salvation” as contrasted with the salvation of the “immortal soul” from everlasting burnings. This occupied two hours. After a recess for refreshment, the audience reassembled to hear Mr. Magruder, who showed that the doctrine advocated was in perfect harmony with the letter and spirit of the texts which remained to be explained.

As to our friend who had induced us to visit the neighbourhood, the meeting was to him a sort of jubilee. A triumphant advocacy, he conceived, had been exhibited in behalf of the great truths he had himself been agitating for so long a time. We were glad to hear from all sides that he was highly esteemed as a good and honest citizen. This was especially gratifying to us, whom he called upon to identify ourselves with him by uniting him in baptism to the name of Jesus Christ. Finding the root of the matter in him, and a determination to abide by the truth through evil as well as through good report, we readily acquiesced in his request, and baptised him in the Mataponi on the morning of our departure for the vicinity of the broad waters of the Rappahannock, in Essex county. The kindness, good feeling, and hospitality of the citizens in general was unreserved. We had nothing to complain of, but much reason to rejoice, and to hope that fruit may appear to everlasting life.

Our party consisted of brethren Edwards, Magruder, self, and daughter. The friends in King William had furnished us with a carriage and horses; so that we were enabled, very agreeably, to make a circuit of about 70 miles from Acquinton. The weather was hot, and the roads sandy, dry, and dusty. With this exception our tour was as pleasant as could be desired. After a drive of twenty-five miles we arrived at the hospitable residence of our friend Mr. Tribble, who is highly respected by all that have the pleasure of his acquaintance. He is at present in the dual number, contending in the midst of gainsayers for the gospel of the kingdom. He was formerly among the “reformers,” to whom he became obnoxious by urging upon their attention “the things of the kingdom” as the hope set before us in the gospel. Not content with rejecting his testimony, they inflicted upon him what petty annoyances were in their power. They injured him in his school, and slandered his character, as the only answer at their command to his arguments and testimonies for the truth. Not being accustomed to hard usage as we are, the treatment he has experienced at their hands has been esteemed a sore affliction. But it is good to be afflicted. It perfects our faith, makes us patient, makes us feel our dependence on God, and strengthens us to endure hardship as good soldiers. We are to “count it all joy when we fall into divers trials” of our faith; for a blessing is pronounced upon all who are persecuted, and falsely reproached for the gospel’s sake. We could not therefore sorrow with our friend, but wish him joy in the communion of persecution he had experienced from the ancient-gospellers in common with ourselves. We doubt not he will treat it as lightly as we do when a little more accustomed to it.

They have not yet denounced him for “one of Murrell’s gang!” This has been said of us in this city as an opinion generally entertained! But are we therefore a robber and a murderer because the slanderer affirms it? Nay. Such speeches, while they show the malice of the enemy, only provoke a smile, and the expression of gratitude to God that he has disarmed Satan, and restricted his enmity to idle and impotent words, which can neither kill us, nor break our bones.

It was expected that the Rappahannock, or Bethanian, meeting house, which was built by public subscription as “a free church,” would have been opened on the week day at least for the accommodation of the citizens. But they were not to have the use of the house they built. Before this was ascertained, notice was given that we should speak there. But the Bethanist leaders took it into their heads that their fellow-citizens should not hear us under the roof that sheltered them. They resolved that the doors and windows should be shut, that neither they nor the light might enter in. These were strange doings for “primitive christians,” who a very few years ago were chilled with pious horror at the awful bigotry of the Baptists in closing their doors against people, who desired only to “prove all things and to hold fast that which was good!” Who would have thought it, that within the short space of twenty years these very “primitives” would have done precisely the same thing! They have cajoled the public into the erection of “free houses,” where all things might be proved for the general good; but as soon as an occasion happens of putting their boastful professions to the proof, they close the doors as if the houses were in deed and truth belonging to them. If an individual were to act thus, they would denounce him for “a covenant-breaker,” and “extortioner,” who enriched himself by the spoils of others. But Bethanian morality transforms individual vices into sectarian virtues, on the principle of “doing evil that good may come.” The good, however, often turns against the evil doers. They violated their compact with the public, and in so doing stirred up its feeling against them. Some of their fellow-citizens, who cared neither for what we were said to teach, nor for their opinions, but who love liberty, and admire consistency and probity, were indignant at their conduct; and turned in with heart and hand to the aid of bro. Tribble in providing accommodation for the public, and refreshments in the adjoining grove. The ground was cleaned up, a stand erected, and seats provided. The petty annoyances bestowed upon our friend, the refusal of the house, and some curiosity to hear us, combined to bring together a large and respectable congregation. The assembly was considerable on Saturday; but far more so on the following day. The weather was fine; but the foliage not being quite dense enough, the sun would sometimes shine in upon us inconveniently. The fable of “the Dog in the Manger” well illustrates the Rappahannock and the Grove in this point of view. A commodious meeting house was in sight, but the “Reformers” would neither use it themselves, nor permit their neighbours its protection from the stroke of a July sun. Under all the circumstances of the case, however, we had more ground of congratulation than complaint. We addressed the people three hours on each day on the things of the kingdom; and showing also how it was to be set up by the God of heaven. Mr. Magruder spoke on Sunday afternoon on some things not touched upon by us. He found even as we that speaking in the open air was no refreshing pastime; but a labor of some severity, which we unrepiningly accept as a modicum of the evil inflicted upon us by the Bethanists for the good we proposed to do them. They have proved themselves “contrary to all men: forbidding us (as far as in them lies) to speak to the people that they might be saved.” It is with pleasure, however, we can testify that there are some in the Rappahannock body who do not approve of the course pursued by their leaders; and who are disposed to listen and to learn. Our controversy is not with such as these, although they may not agree with what we teach. It is with “the leaders,” who in

all ages have “caused the people to err.” We extend the hand of friendship and the olive branch of peace to all of “an honest and good heart,” who are willing for the truth’s sake to prove all things. We entertain no hostile feelings to men who desire to know, and are disposed to do the truth, although they cannot see eye to eye with us. We respect and honor the disposition; and rejoice in its manifestation wherever it appears, in Jew or Gentile, Barbarian or Scythian, bond or free. Understanding the truth, as we believe, our hostility is to every thing contrary to it, and subversive of it; but to those persons only who refuse to hear, and investigate, and yet blindly oppose it, and seek maliciously to injure its advocates. These are blind leaders of the blind. They constitute a class upon whose heads we would pile up coals of fire—Romans 12: 20; but with whom we would be no more at peace than Jesus with the Pharisees, or Paul with those who perverted the gospel he proclaimed. We despise the mean and dastardly creatures, who crawl about emitting their venom against honorable men, who conscientiously believe and advocate, without fee or stipend, and with injury to their temporal affairs, what the malignants have neither sense, honesty of heart, nor knowledge to receive. Men who will not investigate, yet denounce, are either fools or knaves. There are multitudes of this sort of people in all parts of the world. Their unwillingness to investigate what they denounce arises from a diversity of causes. Pride, avarice, love of ease, dullness of intellect, indifference to truth or error, to right or wrong, &c., are among the conditions that involve men in such folly and wickedness. Men who preach a system for so much per annum are very apt to be guilty of denouncing in ignorance and malice whatever is thought to level them with the masses, and to dry up the pools, and stop the mills from which they derive their loaves and fishes. Our controversy is with these sowers of discord and hewers out of broken cisterns; and not with the poor people whom they victimise by their cunning, and by their vapid and effete traditions. The Rappahannock members very properly met at their usual hour, and attended to the things that brought them together. Having disposed of these, it was found expedient to dismiss without making a further draft upon “the evangelist.” His services, therefore, being dispensed with for the time, they all adjourned to the grove, with a very few exceptions, to hear what was being published there. We were glad to observe their advent; for it proved they were not as far gone in bigotry as their co-religionists in some other parts of the Old Dominion. We appeal to their candor, if they did not hear more of God’s testimony quoted and interpreted in our single discourse than from all their “evangelists” put together for a whole year before. Why is this? Because but little scripture is required in ringing the changes on “baptism for remission of sins,” and how the spirit operates, on “the three kingdoms,” and “the three salvations;” but in preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God’s testimony is required from Genesis to Revelation. O that they would awake from the slumber into which they have fallen, and give heed to the joyful sound! There is more in the gospel than comes from Bethany. The Hope of the gospel is known there only as a jest. Both Israel and their hope, and all that advocate the restoration of the kingdom to them, are but a gibe in the mouth of the philosopher who plays the oracle there. Let the disciples of Bethany turn their minds to Moses and the prophets, who speak of “the restitution of all things,” or the glad tidings of the kingdom, and they will soon discover the darkness that broods like chaos over the mind of their Gamaliel. We suspect they heard something on the 20th July that changed their opinion of our teaching in some degree. Why should not they be gratified in hearing the truth as well as people of other sects. Surely prejudice is not too strong to permit them to utter what all candid and thinking men perceive, namely, that if the Bible be true, then we proclaim the truth. We take this opportunity of commending the Rappahannock body for the conclusion of their second and better thoughts. Word was sent us that we could use the meeting house after the recess if we

pleased. For ourselves we had weathered the morning under an umbrella, and were not indisposed to enjoy the grove as a listener in the afternoon. There seemed to be no disposition among the people to adjourn, seeing they had borne the brunt of the inconvenience so long. An hour or so would bring the meeting to a close; when we strangers at least, should all find an old English hospitality and Virginia welcome at the Anglo-American board of bro. Tribble and his intelligent and accomplished lady. And so it came to pass.

* * *

WHAT IT IS TO PROCLAIM THE NAME OF THE LORD.

To proclaim the name of the Lord, therefore, is to do what Jesus did; it is to make known Jesus; it is to show Him who showed the Father; it is to hold Him up of whom it may be said, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." There is no God out of Jesus; there is no name of God but in the name of Jesus; and the being of God neither shall nor can be known otherwise than in the life, and acts, and government of Jesus.

What is meant by proclaiming the name of the Lord, is nearly equal to preaching the Gospel, if men understood what was meant by preaching the Gospel—a word in every body's mouth; in the understanding, in the faith, of, alas, how few! If by preaching the Gospel be understood proclaiming the good news of the kingdom which Christ hath redeemed, and for which he is furnishing the kings and priests from all nations; to which dignity all men are invited through faith in his name; if by preaching the Gospel of Jesus Christ be understood the making known of our God and Father, his mercy, his grace, his long suffering, his holiness, by making known the words and ways and works of his perfect image, to the end of renewing us in the same image, in righteousness and true holiness; then, indeed, there is a perfect identity between preaching the Gospel and proclaiming the name of God; for nothing is Gospel which is not seen to be in God, and from him flowing forth into Christ, and from him again flowing forth unto us, for the end of entwining that triple cord which cannot be broken. But a Gospel of a kingdom without a kingdom is no Gospel at all; a Gospel without the proclamation of grace and goodness to them who hear it; a Gospel of probabilities, of ifs and may-bes, is no good news at all, is no proclamation of the name of God; but a cunning delusion of the devil, and of ignorant or wicked men. If the Gospel were preached as it ought to be, it would be the full and perfect and sufficient word of the kingdom; and when the kingdom shall have come, it would be the Gospel accomplished, as the Gospel is the kingdom promised. When, therefore, the Jewish church thus speaks, "Proclaim his name," it is merely signified that they shall take up that office which we Gentiles have failed in; which we now make a show and sham of performing by means of missionaries, who, if they dared to proclaim Christ and his kingdom, or the name of God, as it is, and ought to be preached, would soon be recalled by their masters, who abominate none so much as those who do so here at home.

The Jews, the Jews shall take up the work in which we have failed, to which we are proving our incompetency by the very efforts which we make: and yet may God speed these efforts; but the time is at hand, and now is, if I err not, when men of another school, with trumpets of another sound, shall go forth from the bosom of this land, and through the midst of heaven proclaim the

name of the eternal God: “Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come.”—Proph Ex.

* * *

A WORD OF ENCOURAGEMENT.

Conecuh, Ala., June 30th, 1851.

Doctor Thomas:

Dear Sir—In the course of human events it has fallen out that I have become acquainted and much interested with the “Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come,” and the important truths it promulgates. You, as editor and promulgator, have broached subjects of the deepest and most profound import, developing principles so totally at war with every thing that the world has heretofore thought and believed, that we may well pause and enquire how can these things be—seeing our mental vision has always been directed heavenward in search of truth, and always held opinions in theology contrary to the doctrines you advocate. “But the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God,” and we have found that by searching the oracles of God what we once thought and believed as truth is contrary to the scriptures, and foolishness in the sight of God; and although our mind’s eye cannot discern as truth all that you hold as such, yet as a system of divinity yours is the most complete, scriptural, and philosophical, in all Christendom. Your keen Damascus blade has swept the whole field of theological controversy, and in one fell swoop demolished, beyond hope of resurrection, the long cherished notion of natural immortality and its kindred doctrines: such as going to “regions beyond the skies,” to enjoy in heaven or suffer in hell, (at death,) all that imagination could conceive.

We must be permitted to say, in all honesty, that when the question of hereditary immortality first presented itself to our mind, such was the power and prejudice of early education, that it was many days ere reason triumphed and truth enabled us to see the way of Life made clear, as revealed in and through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

We are anxiously awaiting the appearance of your “Elpis Israel” in this section of the country, and verily believe it will create “a sensation” among thinking men of all sects and parties. From the nature of the work and the times in which we live, it is doubtless the very book for the times. We opine that it is no holiday affair—that it is a book to be read, and will be read with the profoundest interest. You will hold me responsible for five copies of the work. One to be forwarded to my address per mail, when the subscription for the whole will be sent with instructions where and to whom the various copies are to be mailed.

Yours in hope of Eternal Life,
Through Jesus Christ our Lord,
N.P.

* * *

AN INQUIRING SPIRIT—MATTER FOR A VOLUME.

West Troy, Albany Co., N.Y.

Dear Sir:

I would like to have our brother Editor answer the following questions: Where are the 144,000 in Revelation 7, and who are the great multitude, verse 9th? Are the 144,000 in chapter 14 and 7 the same, and if they are the first fruits and are reigning with Christ? Who is the angel preaching the everlasting gospel to, in chapter 14: 6? Then does not Babylon fall after the first resurrection? Then how will you explain verse 12, “here is the patience of the saints”? Where is the wine press in 14: 19? —Dr. says it is just the size of the Pope’s dominions—it’s without the city (what city?) What is that great city, and how or what is her fall? The merchants (wicked men) are left to weep over her, Revelation 18. Who are they that are called to the Marriage Supper; the Bride (the church) of course would be there before supper, 19: 9? Who are they that walk in the light of the city? When is 3. 9th fulfilled? Where is the Temple in Ezekiel? Is it not where the Jews came and worshipped at the (saints) feet? Rev. and, when do strangers have an Inheritance with the Tribes? Ezekiel, last chapters.

Yours in hope of Eternal Life,
R. E. GORTON.

These things shall be attended to in due course. —Editor.

* * *

A LIBERAL SPIRIT.

Cheneyville, La., Feb. 20th, 1851.

Dear Sir:

I am very glad that you have returned from your trans-Atlantic tour, and to see again the face of my old friend the “Herald.” Its failure for a year or so was annoying to me, particularly because I have never determined either to espouse or reject your views of scripture truth.

I ought to inform you that I have been rejected by the Baptists because I did not believe in two judgments, or, what is equivalent, the immortality of the soul.

I am well acquainted with the Reformers, who have a fine congregation in Cheneyville, and who sometimes manifest the disposition that their brethren do in other places towards those who do not agree with them.

I take the liberty to invite you to Cheneyville, if you should ever visit New Orleans. I will pay your expenses from N. O., and back. * * *

Yours respectfully, P. T.

“ELPIS ISRAEL.”

Rochester, N. Y., July 20th, 1851.

Dear Brother:

I have read your article from “Elpis Israel,” “The three Unclean Spirits like Frogs,” in your “Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come,” which has arrived safe. There seems to me to be so much light in it that I must confess it rather astonished me. Send me “Elpis Israel;” it is doubtless, a book of great value, for the article referred to is of greater value to the sincere inquirer after the truth, than the entire price of the book; and I pray that our heavenly Father will continue to direct your pen that the poor sinner may be led to Jesus; and understand the nature of the glorious kingdom of God, so soon to dawn on a pleasure-seeking generation.

Yours in hope of Immortality
when our Saviour comes,
J. C.

By the time this number is in the possession of our readers, “Elpis Israel” will be nearly out of the binder’s hands. —Editor.

* * *

STRIKING TRUTHS.

“It is unquestionable that political speculations are now largely turned from the dramatic, dynastic and personal interests of history to the life of the nations, the destinies of races and the ultimate prospects of mankind. Our fathers’ generation and our own have been marked by changes so vast and rapid as to strike the least imaginative minds with an anxious sense of temporal instability, and to fill the most imaginative with solemn instincts of an undeveloped providence and dim visions of a future, which no theorems of the schools and of the churches will contain.”—Edinburgh Review, 1850.

“The fear of God in the hearts of the wise, tends ever to enlarge itself, to reject school definitions and to purge the popular creed. Universal nature is but a part of God. Consider the decline of faith. Yet the progress of truth, in the church, the schools and the world, from Tertullian to Bishop Butler, from Ptolemy to Sir J. Herschell, from St. Louis to the King of Prussia! Now sectarianism is the beginning of the end of a blind reverence for human authority.”—Ibid.

Dr. Chalmers—a high orthodox divine—thus satirises the popular idea of Paradise: “The common imagination that we have of Paradise on the other side of death is that of a lofty, aerial region, where the inmates float in ether, or are mysteriously suspended upon nothing—where all warm and sensible accompaniments, which give such an expression of strength, and life and colouring to our present habitation, are attenuated into a sort of spiritual element, that is meagre and imperceptible, and utterly uninviting to the eye of mortals here below—where every vestige of materialism is done away and nothing left but unearthly scenes that have no power of allurements, and certain unearthly ecstasies with which it is felt impossible to sympathise,” &c.

“Prophetic interpretation is not a thing of rambling ingenuity, but of accurate investigation, possessing within itself a thousand corrections of error and confirmations of truth.”